



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ON THE PHILONEAN TEXT OF THE  
SEPTUAGINT.

## QUAESTIONES IN GENESIN.

## SERMO III.

THE following pages are a continuation of the examination of the Septuagint citations in the Armenian allegorical Commentary of Philo of Alexandria, which was commenced in a previous number of the JEWISH QUARTERLY. In 1893 was published in Paris a fourth or fifth century Greek Papyrus of the *Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres*. Many of the citations in Genesis given in Philo's Sermo III are met with in this Treatise, and in examining them as they occur in the Armenian, I have always made use of the text of Philo newly rescued from a Coptic tomb. In using an Armenian Version of Philo, caution must be exercised against the risk of the citations having been adjusted either by the translator or copyists to the text of the Armenian Vulgate. I have, therefore, compared each citation, as it stands in the Armenian Philo, with itself as it stands in the Armenian Vulgate; and have printed in a heavier type those variants which being in the Armenian Philo are also found in that Vulgate. Such a work of comparison, however, has satisfied me that the Version of Philo was made, if not anteriorly to, yet independently of, the Armenian Vulgate; so that if the same variants recur in both, that is so much additional evidence in behalf of, and not against, the Version of Philo.

Wherever a text in the Commentary is cited in any other work of Philo's, I have taken notice of the fact. And the evidence of this Sermo III, and of the first sixty sections of Sermo IV, strengthens a surmise which, from examination of Sermones I and II, I had already formed, namely, that Philo, at different times, and in writing his different works, used different Texts of the LXX. This is in no way surprising. The Greek Text of Genesis was already some two hundred years old when he wrote, and must have swarmed with variants. It is rather remarkable that there are on the whole so few differences between his citations in different works of the same Text.

Qu. 1.—Ch. xv. 7: Τί ἐστι Ἐγὼ εἰμι Κύριος ὁ θεός σου ὁ ἐξαγαγών (or ὁς ἐξηγαγόν) σε ἐκ γῆς Χαλδαίων, ὥστε δοῦναί σοι τὴν γῆν ταύτην κληρονομήσαι;

Here (i) εἰμι is added after ἐγώ.

(ii) Κύριος is added before ὁ θεός.

(iii) σου is added after ὁ θεός.

(iv) ἐκ τῆς γῆς instead of ἐκ χώρας.

Of these (i) εἰμι is added in (Holmes) 20, 37, 59, 61, 76, 106, 107, 129, 134, 135. Slav. Ostrog. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed. We may accept it, therefore, as due to Philo's Text of LXX.

(ii) Κύριος is found in Ambr. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed. We may the less certainly accept it as due to Philo, because in Bouriant's Papyrus of the *Quis Rerum*, i. 486, it is omitted.

(iii) σου is in (Holmes) 37, 59, 61, 79, Ambr., and in Arm. 1. Arm. Ed.; Bouriant's Papyrus of Philo's *Quis Rerum*, i. 486, omits it.

(iv) ἐκ γῆς is given in Mangey in Philo i. 486, where the verse is cited, and in margin of (Holmes) 131. And ἐκ τῆς γῆς in Chrys. iv. 373. But Bouriant's Papyrus has ἐγὼ ὁ θεός ὁς . . . σε ἐκ χώρας. It is not certain, therefore, that Philo here wrote ἐκ τῆς γῆς rather than ἐκ χώρας. The Armenian Vulgate implies ἐκ χώρας and omits ὥστε. The variants (i), (ii), and (iii) being given neither in Mangey's Text of Philo, i. 486, nor in the Papyrus, should not.

perhaps, be reckoned to Philo, but rather to the influence of the Armenian Vulgate. But this also is doubtful, for the latter part of the verse from ἐξαγαγών σε, as given in the Vulgate, varies considerably from the version of Philo.

Qu. 2.—Ch. xv. 8: Διὰ τί φησι Κύριε (or δέσποτα), κατὰ τί γνώσομαι ὅτι κληρονομήσω αὐτήν;

Here either δέσποτα or κύριε is omitted. But as the Armenian has but the single word *Tér* to render both, giving *Tér Tér* as the equivalent in the Vulgate, we cannot be sure which was the original of this passage. δέσποτα indeed seems to be involved in the solutio, which runs thus in Aucher's rendering: "Illi vero, qui promisit, venerationem condignam praestat per dictum, *Domine*. Scio enim te, dicit, Dominum principemque universorum, qui etiam omnia potes, et non est apud te impotentia." Such a commentary harmonizes on the whole better with the reading δέσποτα than with κύριε. In Philo's *Quis Rerum*, i. 487, is read, however, κύριε θεέ (also found in Holmes 19, 108, Compl.). θεέ was certainly not in the original of the Armenian title. The Bouriant Papyrus reads δέσποτα simply, omitting κύριε or θεέ, and we may, therefore, infer that Philo here wrote δέσποτα without addition.

Qu. 3.—Ch. xv. 2: Διὰ τί φησι Λάβε μοι δάμαλιν τριετίζουσας καὶ αἶγα τριετίζουσας καὶ κριὸν τριετίζοντα (καὶ in B)<sup>1</sup>, τρυγὸνα καὶ περιστερὰν;

Here καὶ is omitted before τρυγὸνα. So also in (Holmes) 37, 61, 106 Georg. Therefore Philo omitted it in his LXX. It is worthy of notice that here we have the order δάμαλιν . . . αἶγα . . . κριόν, and that this is implied more than once by the Armenian Commentary to have been the order in which Philo took the words therein. In *Q. R. D. H.* i. 487, 490, the Commentary implies with equal decisiveness the order δάμαλιν . . . κριόν . . . αἶγα found in (Holmes) 37, 129. This variation of order is, therefore, at least as old in the

<sup>1</sup> B is a second MS. of the Armenian Philo, No. 2051 of the Edschmiadzin Patriarchal library, with which I compared the lemmata of Aucher's text.

MSS. of the LXX as Philo. We must suppose that Philo used two different MSS. of the LXX in writing these Quaestiones and in writing the *Quis Rerum Divinarum*.

Qu. 4.—Ch. xv. 10: Διὰ τί φησιν Ἐλαβε δὲ αὐτῷ ταῦτα πάντα;

Here ταῦτα πάντα for πάντα ταῦτα. So (Holmes) X. 14, 18, 25, 32, 37, 38, 57, 59, 61, 72, 73, 75, 78, 79, 106, 128, 129, 130, 131, 135, Cat. Nic. Philo, i. 491. Cyr. Al. Aug. Hesych. in Levit. Georg. There is no doubt but that Philo's LXX had ταῦτα πάντα. The Arm. Vulg. has ἔλαβε δὲ πάντα ταῦτα and omits αὐτῷ.

Qu. 5.—Ch. xv. 10: Τί ἐστι τὸ διείλεν αὐτὸ μέσον καὶ ἔθηκεν ἀλλήλοις (B omits) ἀντιπρόσωπα;

Here (i) αὐτό for αὐτά.

(ii) μέσον for μέσα.

(iii) αὐτά omitted after ἔθηκεν.

(iv) ἀλλήλοις ἀντιπρόσ. for ἀντιπρ. ἀλλ.

Of these (ii) μέσον is in (Holmes) 14, 18, 25, 32, 38, 57, 77, 79, 128, 131. Cat. Nic., and (iii) is in Cyr. Al. Glaph. 70 Georg.

In Philo *Q. R. D. H.* i. 491 the words are cited thus: εἴτ' ἐπιλέγει. Διείλεν αὐτὰ μέσα, a reading furthermore implied in the words of the Commentary i. 502: φάσκων ὅτι τὰ τμήματα ἔθηκεν ἀντιπρόσωπα ἀλλήλοις, where the Greek Text does not seem to have been tampered with. The Arm. Vulg. has διείλεν αὐτὰ μέσα, and uses a different word to render διείλεν.

Here, then, we see a discrepancy in Philo's readings of the LXX, again to be only explained, as in the preceding verses, by supposing that he used different MSS. of the LXX at different times, and that those MSS. had different readings. One of these MSS. had αὐτὸ μέσον and the other αὐτὰ μέσα. The Armenian solutio seems to involve αὐτὸ μέσον in its lemma.

Qu. 6.—Ch. xv. 10: Διὰ τί φησι Τὰ δὲ ὄρνεα οὐ διείλε;

Qu. 7.—Ch. xv. 11: Τί ἐστι Κατέβη δὲ τὰ ὄρνεα ἐπὶ τὰ σώματα τὰ διχοτομηθέντα;

Here τὰ διχοτομηθέντα instead of ἐπὶ τὰ διχοτομήματα αὐτῶν is read in Mangey's Text of Philo i. 506, but the Papyrus has τὰ διχοτομήματα without ἐπὶ or αὐτῶν. It is also found in (Holmes) 20, 75 and Chrys. iv. 375. The following (Holmes) in omitting ἐπὶ keeps a trace of the old reading: I, X, 15, 19, 20, 31, 37, 61, 68, 75, 82, 83, 106, 107, 108, 120, 121, 129, 130. Alex. Slav. Mosq. The Arm. Vulgate="et descendebant aves super divisum membrorum numerum eorum"=ἐπὶ τὰ διχοτομήματα αὐτῶν. Both the variants διχοτομήματα and διχοτομηθέντα seem to have been in Philo's Text of LXX.

Qu. 8.—Ch. xv. 11: Διὰ τί φησιν (παρελθὼν) ἐνεκάθισεν αὐτοῖς Ἀβραάμ; In Latin: "transiit sedit super illas Abraham."

Here Tisch. has (i) συνεκάθισεν and (ii) Ἀβραμ, and (iii) omits παρελθὼν. The latter (iii) is due simply to the Armenian idiom; but ἐνεκάθισεν or ἐπικάθισεν was certainly read in Philo's LXX; for in Q. R. D. H. the citation is given in the same way: ὁ ἀστείος λέγεται αὐτοῖς ἐγκαθίσαι, οἷα προεδρός τις ἢ πρόβουλος ὢν.

In the Armenian solutio of Qu. 10 (Gen. xv. 13) the citation is repeated in the same way: δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἐλέχθη πρότερον ὅτι ἐνεκάθισεν Ἀβραάμ αὐτοῖς.

Qu. 9.—Ch. xv. 12: Τί ἐστι περὶ δυσμὰς ἡλίου ἔκστασις ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀβραάμ, καὶ ἰδοὺ φόβος μέγας σκοτεινὸς ἐπέπεσεν (B ἐπιπίπτει) αὐτῷ;

Here we have (i) δυσμὰς ἡλ. for ἡλ. δυσμὰς, (ii) ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν for ἐπέπεσε τῷ, (iii) Ἀβραάμ for Ἀβραμ, (iv) μέγας σκοτ. for σκοτ. μέγ. This last variant is also implied in the solutio, which however wavers between ἐπιπίπτει and ἐπέπεσεν.

The passage is cited in Q. R. D. H. thrice, wholly or in part, i. 508, 510, 511. At i. 508 ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν is given; at i. 510 ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν. It is certain, therefore, that (ii) ἔπεσεν or ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν was in Philo's LXX. In i. 508, 510, Ἀβραάμ is also given, and was, therefore, in Philo's LXX. The other variants are not given, at least

not in Mangey's Text of i. 508; where the Papyrus has ἐπέστησεν τῷ Ἀβραάμ, though in i. 510, 511, it has ἐπέπεσεν.

Turning to Holmes' sources, we find that (ii) is in margin of X. 135, and in Text of 32, 55, 76, 134. Cyril. Al. Glaph., p. 76. Theodoret in Cat. Nic. 208. Slav. Arm. Ed.; (iv) is in X, 37, 61, 106, 129, 130, while Chrys. iv. 375, has φοβ. μέγ. καὶ σκ.

All the variants, then, of the lemma except (i) may be ascribed to the Text of the LXX used by Philo.

Qu. 10.—Ch. xv. 13: Διὰ τί Ἐρρέθη πρὸς αὐτὸν Γινώσκων γνώση ὅτι πάροικον ἔσται σπέρμα σου ἐν γῇ οὐκ ἰδίᾳ, καὶ δουλώσουσιν καὶ ταπεινώσουσιν καὶ κακώσουσιν αὐτοὺς ἔτη τετρακόσια; B omits the words καὶ ταπεινώσ. καὶ κακώσ.

Here (i) αὐτόν for Ἀβραμ.

(ii) τό omitted before σπέρμα.

(iii) αὐτοὺς omitted twice after δουλώσ. and ταπειν.

(iv) the order ταπεινώσ. κ. κακ. instead of κακ. κ. ταπ.

(v) ἔτη τετρακ. for τετρακ. ἔτη.

In *Q. R. D. H.* i. 511 the verse is thus cited: ἐρρέθη πρὸς Ἀβραάμ . . . γινώσκων (Papyrus omits) γνώση ὅτι πάροικον ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου ἐν γῇ οὐκ ἰδίᾳ. We may, therefore, neglect variants (i) and (ii). Philo's Commentary at i. 511 proves that (iv) also may be set aside; for he writes, ἐν μὲν δὴ παίδευμα τοῦτο· ἔτερον δέ, ὅτι δουλείαν καὶ κάκωσιν καὶ δεινήν, ὥς αὐτὸς ἔφη, ταπεινώσιν ἐπάγοντα τῇ ψυχῇ, τὰ κατὰ γῆν ἔστιν οἰκίδια. This proves that at least the LXX from which he wrote the *Q. R. D. H.* had the same order as Tischendorf.

As to variant (iii) αὐτοὺς after δουλώσουσιν is omitted in Macar. Hom. p. 532. Slav. Ostrog. and other early authorities conflict as to reading, e.g. Alex. and Chrys. have αὐτό. The second αὐτοὺς is omitted in X, 37, 61, 107, 108. Compl. Chrys. i. 192; iv. 375. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed. Variant (v) is in X, 19, 37, 59, 75, 77, 106, 108, 129, 130. Compl. Epiph. i. 153; Chrys. iv. 375; Macar. *l.c.*; Theodoret, i. 78; Cyr. Al. Glaph. p. 70; Arm. 1, Arm. Ed.

There is thus a good probability that (iii) and (v) are due to Philo's own LXX.

Gen. xv. 14 is given in the Arm. Sol. of Qu. 10 as follows : τὸ δὲ ἔθνος ᾧ ἔαν αὐτοὶ (or ἔκεινοι) δουλεύσωσι, κρινῶ ἐγώ· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐξελεύσονται ὧδε μετὰ πολλῆς ἀποσκευῆς.

Here (i) αὐτοὶ is added after ἔαν.

(ii) πολ. ἀποσκ. for ἀποσκ. πολ.

In Philo *Q. R. D. H.* i. 512 the verse is cited according to Tischendorf.

There is no trace in Holmes' sources of the variants (i) and (ii), which are probably mere devices of rendering.

Qu. 11.—Ch. xv. 15 : Τί ἐστι Σὺ δὲ πορεύση (or ἀπελεύση) πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας σου μετ' εἰρήνης τραφεῖς ἐν καλῷ γήρᾳ; The Armenian solutio repeats the citation in the same way.

Here note (i) πορεύση (probably) for ἀπελεύση.

(ii) μετ' εἰρήνης for ἐν εἰρήνῃ.

(iii) καλῷ γ. for γ. καλῷ.

In Philo *Q. R. D. H.* i. 512 the verse is thus cited : Σὺ δὲ ἀπελεύση πρὸς τ. π. σ. μετ' εἰρήνης τραφεῖς ἐν γήρᾳ καλῷ, and in the Commentary i. 513 is read the following : μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἀπελεύση γέγραπται τὸ πρὸς τοὺς π. σου, and on i. 514 μετ' εἰρήνης τραφεῖς is repeated. The original Greek of the Armenian quaestio is given by Wendland from the Cod. Barb., and has ἀπελεύση, not πορεύση.

On the other hand, πορεύση is in (Holmes) 15, 19, 82, 108, 135, Compl., and is implied in the Arm. Vulgate, which in other respects differs from this Armenian lemma.

As to (ii) it is clear that it was in Philo's LXX. It is also found in (Holmes) X, 14, 15, 19, 25, 32, 37, 38, 55, 57, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 106, 107, 108, 129, 134. Compl. Alex. Cat. Nic. Clem. Hom. iii. 650. Orig. iii. 689, 828. Cyr. Al. Glaph., p. 70. Theodoret i. 78.

Variant (iii) is probably a device of rendering, as no other source gives it.

Qu. 12.—Ch. xv. 16 : Διὰ τί φησι τετάρτῃ γενέαι ἀποστραφήσονται ὧδε;

The Armenian translator had mistaken the dative



GENEAI for GENEAI the nom. pl., an error the easier to commit because the plural verb ἀποστραφήσονται follows. In Philo i. 516, 517, the citation is given in the usual form.

Qu. 13.—Ch. xv. 16: Τί ἐστιν Οὕπω ἀναπεπλήρωνται αἱ ἁμαρτίαι τῶν Ἀμορραίων ἕως τοῦ νῦν (but for ἕως τ. νῦν Text B has “coram me”);

This agrees with Tischendorf, but in Philo *Q. R. D. H.* i. 516, we read thus: Τὸ δὲ ἄχρι τίνος, αὐτὸς μνηύει, λέγων, Οὕπω γὰρ ἀναπεπλήρωνται αἱ ἀνομίαι τῶν Ἀμορραίων, and in i. 517, l. 10: Ἐως μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἀναπεπλήρωνται τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τῶν Ἀμορραίων. That ἀνομίαι was read in some Texts is certain because it is in (Holmes) 59, and is implied in Greg. Naz. *Adv. Iul.*, Orat. III. p. 60. We may almost infer that in one of Philo's codices of the LXX ἀνομίαι was read with ἁμαρτήματα written in the margin, and that in another there stood ἁμαρτίαι.

Qu. 14.—Ch. xv. 17: Τί ἐστιν Ἐπειδὴ ὁ ἥλιος ἐγένετο πρὸς δυσμὰς, φλόξ ἐγένετο;

Here ἐπειδὴ for ἐπεὶ δέ.

The citation occurs in Philo i. 517, where in Mangey's Edition is read ἐπεὶ δέ. Philo himself certainly read ἐπειδὴ in his LXX; for that is implied in the Arm. solutio, which begins thus: ἡ ὁ ἥλιος φλογοειδὴς ἐφαίνετο πρὸς δυσμὰς γενόμενος ἢ ἄλλη φλόξ πρὸς ἐσπέραν κ.τ.λ. The Armenian Vulgate has ἐπεὶ δέ. In Chrys. iv. 368 ἐπειδὴ is read. ἐπειδὴ δέ is in (Holmes) 57, 107, 134, 135, and ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἤδη in X.

Qu. 15.—Ch. xv. 17: Τί ἐστιν, Ἰδοὺ κλίβανος καπνίζομενος καὶ λαμπάδες πυρὸς αἱ διήλθον ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν διχοτομημάτων;

Here τούτων is omitted after διχοτομημάτων, an omission certainly due to Philo's LXX, as it also occurs in (Holmes) 20, 57, 75; Philo i. 518; Chrys. iv. 378; Theodoret, ut videtur, ii. 1692; Copt. Arab. In Philo i. 518 ἀνά is omitted before μέσον.

Qu. 16.—Ch. xv. 18: Διὰ τί φησιν Ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ

διαθήκην διέθετο τῷ Ἀβραάμ, λέγων· Τῷ σπέρματί σου δώσω τὴν γῆν ταύτην ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ Αἰγύπτου ἕως τοῦ ποταμοῦ (? τοῦ) μεγάλου Εὐφράτου ;

Here διαθ. διέθ. τῷ Ἀβ. instead of διέθ. Κύριος τῷ Ἀβραμ διαθήκην. In Philo i. 518 the citation runs thus: ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, φησίν, ἐκείνῃ συνέθετο Κύριος τῷ Ἀβραὰμ συνθήκην λέγων, where also is read τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου, Εὐφράτου.

The Armenian lemma would equally allow of συνθήκην συνέθετο (or of ἔθετο) and does not, therefore, really conflict with Philo i. 518. The variants of the Armenian seem due to citation only.

Qu. 17.—Ch. xv. 19: Τίνες εἰσιν οἱ Κεναῖοι καὶ Κερεζαῖοι καὶ Κεδמוναῖοι καὶ Χεταῖοι καὶ Φερεζαῖοι καὶ Ῥαφαεῖν καὶ Ἀμορραῖοι καὶ Χαναναῖοι καὶ Γεργεσαῖοι καὶ Ἰεβουσαῖοι ; (Another MS. has the order Χεταῖοι καὶ Κεδמוναῖοι.)

Here the words καὶ τοὺς Εὐαῖους are omitted. The Armenian Commentary and Philo i. 536 alike demonstrate that Philo in his copies of the LXX omitted them. They are also omitted in (Holmes) X, 18, 19, 56, 72, 82, 106, 107, 129, 135. Compl. Cat. Nic. Copt. Arab. 3, Arm. 1, Arm. Ed.

Qu. 18.—Ch. xvi. 1: Διὰ τί Σάρα ἡ γυνὴ Ἀβραὰμ οὐκ ἔτικτεν ;

Here αὐτῷ is omitted after ἔτικτεν, an accident of citation for in Philo i. 519 it is suggested and also implied by the words in Philo i. 520, l. 9: Σάρρα οὖν ἡ ἀρχουσά μου τῆς ψυχῆς ἀρετῇ, ἔτικτε μέν, οὐκ ἔτικτε δ' ἐμοί.

Qu. 19.—Ch. xvi. 1: Τί ἐστὶν ἣν αὐτῇ παιδίσκη Αἰγυπτία ᾗ (B. om.) ὄνομα Ἀγαρ ;

Here the Arm. solutio has Ἀγαρ.

Qu. 20.—Ch. xvi. 2: Διὰ τί εἶπε Σάρα πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ Ἰδοὺ συνέκλεισέ με Κύριος τοῦ μὴ τίκτειν· εἴσελθε πρὸς τὴν παιδίσκην ἵνα τεκνοποιήσῃς ἐξ αὐτῆς ; (Codex B paraphrases: "Cur dixit Sara ad Abraham iamiam cognovi quia conclusit meus dominus uterum meum ; intra," &c.).

Here (i) οὖν is omitted after εἴσελθε.

(ii) μου after παιδίσκην.

(iii) τεκνοποιήσης for τεκνοποιήσωμαι.

The same citation is given in Philo i. 519, and there agrees in (i) and (iii) with the Armenian lemma. These variants, therefore, we may at once ascribe to Philo's LXX. The variant (ii) is in (Holmes) 77; also Cyr. Al. vi, parte prima, p. 48, reads σου. Perhaps this omission is due to citation. (i) is in (Holmes) 31, 68, 120, 121. Ald. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed. (iii) τεκνοποιήσης is in III, X, 38, 74, 129, 134. Chrys. iv. 384. Cyr. Alex. vi. Also τεκνοποιήσεις, which answers to the Armenian, perhaps, better than τεκνοποιήσης, is in 56, 76, 106.

Qu. 21.—Ch. xvi. 3: Διὰ τί γυναῖκα Ἀβραὰμ εἶπε τὴν Σάραν, λαβοῦσα γάρ φησι Σάρα ἢ γυνὴ Ἀβραὰμ τὴν ἑαυτῆς παιδίσκην Ἄγαρ τὴν Αἰγυπτίαν ἔδωκεν εἰς χεῖρας (or ἐν χερσίν) αὐτοῦ; But one of the Edschmiadsin MSS. omits ἑαυτῆς παιδίσκην, another transposes after Αἰγυπτίαν, and for εἰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ, both imply τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς.

The same citation is given in Philo i. 429, but in a form agreeing with Tischendorf, save that there is read ἔδωκε τῷ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ αὐτῆς ἀνδρί, αὐτῷ εἰς γυναῖκα instead of ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς αὐτῷ γυναῖκα.

In the Armenian lemma we have—

(i) τὴν ἑαυτῆς παιδ. set before, instead of after, Ἄγαρ τὴν Αἰγ.

(ii) μετὰ δέκα ἔτη—Χαναάν is omitted.

(iii) ἔδωκεν εἰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ.

Of these (ii) is found in Holmes, 106; it is, therefore, doubtful if the omission is merely due to citation. Variants (i) and (iii) also have not the air of being accidents of citation, yet one hesitates to attribute them, without evidence from other sources, to Philo's LXX.

Qu. 22.—Ch. xvi. 4: Τί ἐστὶν εἶδεν ὅτι ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχει καὶ ἡτιμάσθη ἢ Κυρία ἐναντίον αὐτῆς; (But Codex B omits the words: ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχει καί, and also ἡ Κυρία.)

Qu. 23.—Ch. xvi. 5: Διὰ τί Σάρα ὥς μετεμέλησεν, εἶπε δὲ πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ Ἀδικοῦμαι ἐκ σοῦ· ἐγὼ δέδωκα τὴν παιδίσκην μου

εἰς τὸν κόλπον σου, ἰδοῦσα δὲ ὅτι ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχει ἡτιμάσθην ἐναντίον αὐτῆς ;

In Philo i. 539 ἐνώπιον αὐτῆς, and may equally with ἐναντίον αὐτῆς have been in the original Greek of the Quaestio.

Qu. 24.—Ch. xvi. 6 : Διὰ τί φησιν Ἀβραὰμ Ἰδοὺ ἡ παιδίσκη σου ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ σου· χρῶ αὐτῇ ὥς ἂν σοι ἀρεστόν ᾖ ; But Codex B omits ἐν τ. χ. σου, and thus implies simply χρῶ ὅ, τι ἂν θέλῃς.

The citation is also in Philo i. 541 ; omitting σου after παιδίσκη and ᾖ after ἀρεστόν ; though according to Mangey's note some MSS. add ᾖ.

Qu. 25.—Ch. xvi. 6 : Διὰ τί φησιν ἐκάκωσεν αὐτὴν Σάρα ;

Qu. 26.—Ch. xvi. 6 : Διὰ τί ἀποδιδράσκει Ἀγαρ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτῆς ;

Here τοῦ is omitted as in verse 8.

Qu. 27.—Ch. xvi. 7 : Τί ἐστὶν εὖρεν αὐτὴν ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἐπὶ τῆς πηγῆς τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ Σούρ ;

Here ἐπὶ τῆς πηγῆς is omitted before ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ Σ. It is certain that Philo omitted it in his LXX, for it is omitted in (Holmes) 75, 106. Chrys. iv. 389. Cyr. Al. Glaph., p. 72. In Mangey's Text Philo i. 546, where the citation occurs, ἐπὶ τῆς πηγῆς τῆς ἐν τῇ ἐρ. is read.

Qu. 28.—Ch. xvi. 8 : Διὰ τί εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ ἄγγελος Ἀγαρ παιδίσκη Σάρας, πόθεν ἔρχῃ καὶ ποῦ πορεύῃ ;

Here Κυρίου is omitted after ἄγγελος. In Mangey's Text Philo i. 546, where the citation occurs, Κυρίου is added.

Qu. 29.—Ch. xvi. 8 : Τί ἐστὶν, Ἀπὸ προσώπου Σάρας τῆς κυρίας μου ἐγὼ ἀποδιδράσκω ;

Qu. 30.—Ch. xvi. 9 : Διὰ τί εἶπεν ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτῇ Ἀποστράφθαι πρὸς τὴν κυρίαν σου καὶ ταπεινώθῃτι ὑπὸ τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς ;

Here Κυρίου is again omitted after ἄγγελος, this time also in (Holmes) 108. Compl. We cannot, however, safely attribute the omission to the Text of Philo's LXX, for in Philo i. 546 Κυρίου is supplied.

Qu. 31.—Ch. xvi. 10 : Διὰ τί εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ ἄγγελος· Πλη-

οὐνῶ φησι τὸ σπέρμα σου καὶ οὐκ ἀριθμηθήσεται ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους ;

Here are omitted (i) Κυρίου after ἄγγελος, and (ii) πληθύνων before πληθυνῶ.

Of these both may possibly have occurred in Philo's LXX, but there is no other evidence to bring but the Armenian lemma.

Qu. 32.—Ch. xvi. 11 : Τί ἐστὶν Εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ ἄγγελος Ἰδοὺ σὺ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχεις καὶ τέξεις υἱὸν καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰσμαήλ, ὅτι ἐπήκουσε Κύριος τῇ ταπεινώσει σου ;

Here (i) Κυρίου is omitted after ἄγγελος. It is remarkable that throughout this passage Κυρίου is omitted in the lemmata after ἄγγελος.

(ii) τέξεις for τέξη seems to be implied by the Armenian and is found in Philo i. 546, where the citation occurs.

Qu. 33.—Ch. xvi. 12 : Τί ἐστὶν, Οὗτος ἔσται ἄγροικος ἄνθρωπος· αἱ χεῖρες αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πάντας, καὶ αἱ χεῖρες πάντων ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ κατοικήσει ;

I suspect that αὐτοῦ after ἀδελφῶν is an interpolation either in the original Greek of this title or in the Arm. MSS. For (i) in the Arm. solutio itself we read thus : διό φησι κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν ἀδελφῶν κατοικήσει, omitting αὐτοῦ : (ii) in (Holmes) 135 and Philo i. 577 αὐτοῦ is also omitted ; (iii) the Arm. Vulgate like Tischendorf's Text adds αὐτοῦ, so a scribe may have added it, though otherwise the Armenian lemma shows no trace of having been revised according to the Arm. Vulgate.

Qu. 34.—Ch. xvi. 13 : Διὰ τί φησι, Καὶ ἐκάλεσε ὄνομα Κυρίου τοῦ λαλοῦντος πρὸς αὐτήν, Σὺ θεὸς ὁ ἐπιδὼν με· ὅτι εἶπε, Καὶ γὰρ ἐνὶ ὅπιον εἶδον ὀφθέντα μοι ;

In Philo i. 577 ὁ is omitted before θεός, also in Holmes 82, but the Arm. title does not make it certain that it was omitted in the original Greek of the title. Nor is it certain that τό was omitted before ὄνομα in the original Greek of the Quaestio ; the omission may be in the rendering only. Holmes 82 and Ald. omit.

Qu. 35.—Ch. xvi. 14: Τί ἐστιν ἕνεκεν τούτου ἐκάλεσε τὸ φρέαρ φρέαρ οὐ ἐνώπιον εἶδον ;

In Philo i. 577 διὰ is read instead of ἕνεκεν. The Arm. title is not decisive as to which was read in its Greek original.

Qu. 36.—Ch. xvi. 14: Διὰ τί τὸ φρέαρ ἀνὰ μέσον Κάδης καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Φαρράν εἶναι λέγει ;

Here Φαρράν is used for Βαράδ. In (Holmes) Arm. 2 Φαρράν is implied. The Arm. Vulg. has Βαράδ. Philo's LXX certainly had Φαρράν.

Qu. 37.—Ch. xvi. 15: Τί ἐστιν ἕτεκεν Ἀγαρ τῷ Ἀβραὰμ υἱόν ;

Qu. 38.—Ch. xvi. 16: Διὰ τί ἐξ καὶ ὀγδοήκοντα ἐτῶν Ἀβραὰμ λέγεται εἶναι ἡνίκα ἔτεκεν αὐτῷ τὸν Ἰσμαήλ ;

The Armenian solutio seems to imply that ὀγδοηκονταῆξ stood in the Greek original of the title, for it begins thus: "Οτι τὸ ἐπόμενον τῷ ὀγδοήκοντα τὸ ἐξ πρῶτος ἐστι τέλειος ἀριθμός.

In any case the Arm. title sets ἐτῶν after and not before the numeral, and so agrees with (Holmes) X, 14, 15, 16, 18, 38, 56, 57, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79, 82, 83, 128, 129, 131, 134, 135 Alex. The other variant also, αὐτῷ for τῷ Ἀβραμ, must not be ascribed to Philo's LXX.

Qu. 39.—Ch. xvii. 1: Διὰ τί γενομένῳ ἐνενηκονταεννέα ἐτῶν φησι, ὥφθη Κύριος ὁ θεὸς καὶ εἶπε Ἐγὼ Κύριός εἰμι ὁ Θεός σου ;

Here (i) ἐτῶν is placed after the numeral.

(ii) ὁ θεός is added after ὥφθη Κύριος.

(iii) Κύριος is added after ἐγώ.

All these variations are endorsed by the solutio, and may be ascribed to Philo's LXX. As to Holmes' sources, (i) is in 129, 134, (ii) in Chrys. iv. 396, 397, Κύριος is replaced by ὁ θεός, and Κύριος ὁ θεός is in 59. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed. As to (iii), ἐγὼ εἰμι Κύριος ὁ θεός is read in 135, and Philo i. 582: "et hanc lectionem urget in Commentario, licet alibi saepe habeat θεός simpliciter." (Holmes ad loc.)

Qu. 40.—Ch. xvii. 2, 3: Τί ἐστιν, Εὐαρέστει ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ, καὶ γίνου ἄμεμπτος, καὶ θήσω τὴν διαθήκην μου ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον σοῦ, καὶ πληθυνῶ σε σφόδρα σφόδρα ;

Here (i) σφ. σφ. for σφ. singly.

(ii) θήσω for θήσομαι is doubtful. But as it is read in Philo i. 586, Cat. Nic., and in the MSS., 14, 15, 16, 18, 37, 56, 57, 59, 73, 75, 77, 78, 82, 106, 107, 128, 130, 131, 135, which usually have the Philonean tradition, and as it agrees better with the Armenian than would θήσομαι, we may assume that it was read.

As to σφόδρα σφόδρα, it is certain that Philo read it in his LXX, for the Arm. solutio urges it, as follows: τὸ δὲ δις λέγειν πληθυνῶ σε σφόδρα σφόδρα τὸ πλήθους ἀπερίγραφτον φανερώς δηλοῖ. The same variant is in (Holmes), 15, 16, 18, 25, 57, 59, 73, 77, 78, 79, 82, 130, 131, 135. Cat. Nic. Procop. in Cat. Nic. 221, Arm. 1. Arm. Ed.

In the Arm. solutio is also read: τὸ γὰρ θήσω τὴν διαθήκην μου ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ, as if the second ἀνὰ μέσον were omitted. Procopius omits it l. c.

Qu. 41.—Ch. xvii. 3: Τί ἐστιν, ἔπεσεν Ἀβραὰμ ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ;

Here αὐτοῦ is omitted after πρόσωπον. So also (Holmes) 106, 107, Philo i. 586. Praemittit \* in textu, cum eodem signo in margine, Arm. 1. We may infer that Philo's LXX omitted αὐτοῦ.

Qu. 42.—Ch. xvii. 3, 4: Τί ἐστιν καὶ ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς λέγων Καὶ ἐγώ, ἰδοὺ ἡ διαθήκη μου μετὰ σοῦ, καὶ ἔση πατήρ πλήθους ἐθνῶν ;

Qu. 43.—Ch. xvii. 5: Τί ἐστιν Οὐ κληθήσεται τὸ ὄνομά σου Ἀβραμ, ἀλλ' Ἀβραὰμ ἔσται τὸ ὄνομά σου ;

Here (i) ἔτι is omitted after κληθήσεται.

(ii) ἀλλ' Ἀβραὰμ ἔσται τὸ ὄ. σου for ἀλλ' ἔσται τὸ ὄ. σ. Ἀβ.

(i) is in (Holmes) 72 and Philo i. 587, therefore it was in Philo's LXX ; (ii) is read in Eusebius, while Alex. has ἔστ. Ἀβρ. τὸ ὄ. σου. No doubt the title preserves the reading of Philo's LXX, though in Philo i. 587, the order of Tischendorf is found.

Qu. 44.—Ch. xvii. 6: Τί ἐστιν Αὐξανῶ σε σφόδρα, καὶ θήσω σε εἰς ἔθνη, καὶ βασιλεῖς ἐκ σοῦ ἔσονται ;

Here Tischendorf has σφόδρα σφόδρα. But the second

*σφόδρα* is omitted in (Holmes) III, 135. Aug. Copt. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed.; habet in minore caractere Alex. The title is repeated in the solutio without change. The omission of second *σφ.* may, therefore, be set down to Philo's LXX. *ἔσονται* for *ἐξελεύσονται* must be due to Philo's LXX, for Ambrose has "de te erunt."

Qu. 45.—Ch. xvii. 8: *Τί ἐστι δώσω σοὶ καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου μετὰ σὲ τὴν γῆν ἣν παρῳήκῃς, πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν Χαναὰν εἰς κατάσχεσιν αἰώνιον;*

Here the perfect *παρῳήκῃς* is not to be accounted for unless it was Philo's own reading. The Arm. Vulgate has *παροικεῖς*, besides many other differences.

Qu. 46.—Ch. xvii. 10, 11: *Τί ἐστι Περιτμηθήσεται πᾶν ἀρσενικὸν ὑμῶν καὶ περιτμηθήσεσθε τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας;*

Here we have (i) *πᾶν ἀρσ. ὑμ.* for *ὑμῶν πᾶν ἀρσ.*, a variation not found in any other source; (ii) *ὑμῶν* is, perhaps, omitted after *ἀκροβυστίας*. Some Armenian MSS. have *ὑμῖν* for *ὑμῶν* after *ἀρσενικόν*, a reading found in (Holmes) 19, 37, 38, 106, 107, 108. Compl.

Qu. 47.—Ch. xvii. 10: *Διὰ τί τὸ ἀρσενικὸν μόνον κελεύει περιτέμνειν;*

Qu. 48.—Ch. xvii. 12: *Διὰ τί φησι, Καὶ παιδίον ὀκταήμερον περιτμηθήσεται πᾶν ἀρσενικόν;*

Here (i) *ὑμῖν* is omitted after *περιτμηθήσεται*.

(ii) *ὀκταήμερον* for *ὀκτὼ ἡμερῶν*.

(ii) is in (Holmes) 59, 128, Arm. 1. Arm. Ed. Cyr. Al. Glaph. p. 72. This may, therefore, be set down to Philo's LXX; as may with almost equal certainty the omission (i) of *ὑμῖν*, though not found in other sources.

Qu. 49.—Ch. xvii. 12: *Διὰ τί ἐν τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἡμέρᾳ τὴν περιτομὴν ἐντελλέται;*

Qu. 50.—Ch. xvii. 12: *Διὰ τί τοὺς οἰκογενεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἀργυρωνήτους περιτέμνει;*

Qu. 51.—Ch. xvii. 13: *Τί ἐστι, Καὶ ἔσται ἡ διαθήκη μου ἐπὶ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν;*

Qu. 52.—Ch. xvii. 14: *Διὰ τί ἐπὶ παιδίου κατακρίνει θανάτου κρίσιν λέγων, Ἀπερίτμητος ἄρσεν ὅς οὐ περιτμη-*



θήσεται τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἐκείνη ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτῆς ;

Here αὐτοῦ is omitted after ἀκροβυστίας. Holmes notes thus : αὐτοῦ] praemittit \* in textu, cum eodem signo in margine, Arm. 1. It is, therefore, probable that Philo's LXX omitted it.

Qu. 53.—Ch. xvii. 15 : Διὰ τί λέγει, Σάρα ἡ γυνή σου οὐ κληθήσεται Σάρα, ἀλλὰ Σάρρα ἔσται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς ;

Here (i) τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς is omitted after κληθήσεται : (ii) ἀλλὰ is added before Σάρρα. The former is not found in any of Holmes' MSS., but is in Philo i. 130, so that we may ascribe it to Philo's LXX. So we may (ii) for the same reason. We find ἀλλὰ also in (Holmes) X, 14-19, 25, 31, 32, 38, 55, 56, 57, 59, 68, 71, 73, 75-79, 82, 83, 106-108, 120, 121, 128-131, 134, 135. Compl. Alex. Chrys. iv. 404. Cyr. Al. vi, parte prima, 49. Aug. Slav. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed. Georg. In Philo i. 130 αὐτῆς is read after Σάρρα, instead of at the end of the sentence.

Qu. 54.—Ch. xvii. 16 : Διὰ τί φησι, Δώσω σοι ἐξ αὐτῆς τέκνα καὶ εὐλογήσω αὐτήν, καὶ ἔσται εἰς ἔθνη, καὶ βασιλεῖς ἐθνῶν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἔσονται ;

Here τέκνα for τέκνον is urged in the Arm. solutio, which Aucher thus renders : "Vix oportet quaerere, quod in plurali dixerit Pueros unicum dilectumque filium eorum." Therefore Philo so read in his LXX. From Philo i. 601 it is certain that Philo read in his LXX αὐτῆς, not αὐτοῦ, before ἔσονται. This is as compatible with the Armenian as αὐτοῦ ; and it also renders it certain that he read in his LXX after εὐλογήσω, not αὐτό or αὐτόν, but αὐτήν, of which the Armenian equally admits. For after τέκνα neither αὐτό nor αὐτόν would be appropriate. But if εὐλογήσω αὐτήν was read here, it becomes probable that Philo's LXX omitted εὐλογήσω δὲ αὐτήν at the beginning of the verse. Of that the Armenian is not decisive, though it is sufficient that in the Philonean title the citation begins from δώσω only. In Philo *De Nom. Mut.* i. 598, l. 12, this surmise is confirmed, for we read : ἀποχρώντως οὖν περὶ τῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων ἀλλαγῆς

τε καὶ μεταθέσεως εἰρηκότες, ἐπὶ τὰ ἐξῆς τῆς ἐφόδου τρεψόμεθα κεφάλαια. Εἴπετο δὲ εὐθύς ἡ γένεσις Ἰσαάκ· καλέσας γὰρ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ Σάρραν ἀντὶ Σάρας, φησὶ τῷ Ἀβραάμ, Δώσω σοι τέκνον. And Philo i. 600, l. 41, we have εὐλογήσω δέ, φησὶν, αὐτήν, καὶ ἔσται εἰς ἔθνη. It is certain, therefore, that Philo's LXX (i) omitted εὐλογήσω δὲ αὐτήν, καί: (ii) read τέκνα not τέκνον: (iii) αὐτήν not αὐτό: (iv) αὐτῆς not αὐτοῦ. The MSS. of Philo have been conformed to later Texts of the LXX at i. 598, l. 17.

Qu. 55.—Ch. xvii. 17: Διὰ τί Ἀβραὰμ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ ἐγέλασε; (But cod. B. has the order ἔπεσεν Ἀβραάμ.)

Here are the following variants: (i) Ἀβρ. ἔπ. for ἔπ. Ἀβρ.: (ii) τὸ πρόσωπον for πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ. The latter was in Philo's LXX, for against αὐτοῦ Holmes notes thus: "habet in minore charact. Alex.; praefigit \* in textu, cum eodem signo in margine, Arm. 1." Omit III, X, 57, 59, 72, 73, 76, 78, 79, 106, 134, 136; Philo i. 130; Chrys. iv. 405; Cyr. Al. vi, parte prima, 49.

Qu. 56.—Ch. xvii. 17: Διὰ τί ὡς ἀπιστεῖ τῷ χρησθέντι Εἶπε γάρ φησιν ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ εἰ τῷ ἑκατονταετεί υἱὸς γενήσεται, καὶ Σάρρα ἐνενηκονταετῆς τέξεται;

Here (i) αὐτοῦ λέγων is omitted after διανοίᾳ.

(ii) υἱὸς γενήσεται for γεν. υἱός.

(iii) εἰ omitted before Σάρρα.

(iv) ἐνενηκονταετῆς for ἐνενήκοντα ἐτῶν.

(i) αὐτοῦ is omitted in 106, 108, Compl., and λέγων in 14, 15, 16, 18, 25, 38, 59, 72, 77, 78, 79, 82. Cat. Nic. Slav. Ostrog. Arab. 3, Georg. In Philo i. 605, l. 13, we read: γελάσας εὐθύς εἶπε τῇ διανοίᾳ Εἰ τῷ ἑκατονταετεί γενήσεται, καὶ ἡ Σάρρα ἐνενήκοντα ἐτῶν οὕσα τέξεται; Μὴ τοι νομίσης, ὦ γενναῖε, τὸ εἰπεῖν οὐχὶ τῷ στόματι, ἀλλὰ τῇ διανοίᾳ προσκείσθαι παρέργως, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντῃ ἐζητασμένως. This almost proves that αὐτοῦ λέγων was omitted in Philo's LXX, as it certainly proves that καὶ was read for εἰ before Σάρρα. In the Armenian solutio the words εἶπεν ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ are again repeated, but still without αὐτοῦ λέγων.

(ii) is in Epiph. i. 153, 154. But as the Greek Philo omits *υἱός* in i. 605, 104, and only retains it once, i. 130, and then has the order *γενήσεται υἱός*, it may well be doubted if it stood at all in his LXX. The Armenian solutio gives no hint of *υἱός*. Holmes' MSS. 15, 55, 59, 74, 76, 82, 134 omit it. The very dissonance of order between the Arm. title and Philo i. 130, points to its having been originally absent from the Text.

The third variant is found in 14, 15, 18, 31, 32, 57, 82, 131. Cat. Nic.; Philo i. 130; i. 605; Cyr. Al. vi, parte prima, 49. It may, therefore, be set down to Philo's LXX. Perhaps the *ἡ* before *Σάρρα* was also absent from the original Greek of the Quaestio. Variant (iv) does not occur in any other sources, but the Arm. solutio also implies it. Philo i. 104, 130, 695 has *ἐνενήκοντα ἐτῶν οὔσα*.

Qu. 57.—Ch. xvii. 18: *Διὰ τί εἶπεν Ἀβραὰμ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν Ἰσμαὴλ οὗτος ζήτω ἐνώπιόν σου*;

Qu. 58.—Ch. xvii. 19: *Διὰ τί ὁ χρησμός θεοῦ εἰς ὁμολόγησιν λέγων τῷ Ἀβραάμ· Ναί· ἰδοὺ Σάρρα ἡ γυνὴ σου τέξεται σοι υἱόν*;

Here τῷ Ἀβραάμ instead of πρὸς τὸν Ἀβραάμ. The same reading occurs in X, 14, 15, 16, 18, 25, 56, 59, 72, 75, 77, 78, 79, 82, 129, 130, 135. Alex. Cat. Nic. Philo, i. 617; Arm. i. Arm. Ed. Georg. It may, perhaps, be ascribed to Philo's LXX.

Qu. 59.—Ch. xvii. 20: *Διὰ τί φησι, Περὶ δὲ Ἰσμαὴλ ἰδοὺ (om. cod. B.) ἐπακούσομαί σου, καὶ εὐλόγησω αὐτόν (Add. καὶ B.) δώδεκα ἔθνη γεννήσει*;

Here Tisch. reads: *Περὶ δὲ Ἰσμαὴλ ἰδοὺ ἐπήκουσά σου, Καὶ ἰδοὺ εὐλόγηκα αὐτόν, καὶ αὐξάνω αὐτόν, Καὶ πληθυνῶ αὐτὸν σφόδρα· δώδεκα ἔθνη γεννήσει*. In Philo i. 618, is given: *Διό φησιν εὐλόγηκα αὐτόν, αὐξήσω αὐτόν, πληθυνῶ, δώδεκα ἔθνη γεννήσει*.

The future *εὐλογήσω* is in Compl. Arm. . . . Arm., Ed., and should perhaps be ascribed to Philo's LXX. Other differences are due to the citation only.

Qu. 60.—Ch. xvii. 21: *Διὰ τί φησι, Τὴν δὲ διαθήκην μου*

στήσω πρὸς Ἰσαάκ, ὃν τέξεται Σάρρα εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἐν τῷ ἐνιαντῷ τῷ ἐτέρῳ ;

Here σοι is omitted after τέξεται. In Philo i. 618, however, it is supplied.

Qu. 61.—Ch. xvii. 24, 25: Διὰ τί φησιν ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ ἦν ἐτῶν ἐνενήκοντα καὶ ἐννέα ἡνίκα περιετέμετο, Ἰσμαὴλ δὲ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἐτῶν τρισκαίδεκα ;

Here we have (i) ἦν ἐτ. ἐνεν. καὶ ἐν. for ἐνεν. ἦν ἐτ.

(ii) τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας αὐτοῦ is omitted after περιετέμετο.

(iii) τρισκαίδεκα for δεκατριῶν.

Of these, (i) is in (Holmes) 19, 25, 56, 106, 107, 108, 129, 130. Compl. Aug.: "et sic primo 134 et sic nisi quod καὶ interponant ante ἐννέα 59. Slav. Ostrog. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed.," and may be set down to Philo's LXX, as also, perhaps, may (iii), which is in (Holmes) 15. The omission (ii) is due to title.

Qu. 62.—Ch. xvii. 27: Διὰ τί ἐξ ἀλλογενῶν ἐθνῶν περιτέμνει Ἀβραάμ ;

This title implies that after ἐθνῶν were added the words περιέτεμεν αὐτούς found in (Holmes) X, 15, 25, 56, 59, 71, 72, 75, 82, 106, 129, 135. Alex. Copt. Arab. 3, Slav. Ostrog. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed., while καὶ περιέτεμεν αὐτούς is added in 14, 16, 18, 32, 38, 56, 57, 68, 73, 74, 76-79, 83, 107, 120, 121, 128, 130, 131, 134. Ald. Cat. Nic. Slav. Mosq. Georg.

## PHILONIS EARUM QUAE IN GENESI QUAESTIONUM ET SOLUTIONUM.

### SERMO QUARTUS.

Qu. 1.—Ch. xviii. 1, 2: Διὰ τί φησι, Ὡφθη δὲ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἐν τῇ ὁρᾷ τῇ Μαμβρῇ καθημένου αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ θερμῷ τῆς ἡμέρας πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ τῆς σκηνῆς αὐτοῦ, ἀνέβλεψε δέ ;

Tischendorf has: Ὡφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Θεὸς πρὸς τῇ ὁρᾷ τῇ

Μαμβρηῇ, καθημένον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας τῆς σκηνῆς αὐτοῦ μεσημβρίας. ἀναβλέψας δὲ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ, κ.τ.λ.

Either the citation in the Quaestio is a very free one or the Text has been tampered with, for the Armenian solutio requires it rather to have run thus: "Ὡφθη δὲ K. ὁ Θ. τῷ 'A. ἐν τῇ δρυὶ τῇ M. καθ. αὐτοῦ πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ τῆς σκ. μεσημβρίας, ἀναβλέψας δὲ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς. Thus the only variants to which we can attach any weight are: (i) αὐτῷ omitted before ὁ Θεός, and replaced after Θεός by τῷ 'Αβραάμ; (ii) Κύριος added before ὁ Θεός; (iii) ἐν τῇ δρυὶ for πρὸς τῇ δρυὶ; (iv) πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ for ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας.

Of these, that (i) may be set down to mere citation is clear from the fact that in the solutio of Qu. 2 the citation recurs according to Tischendorf's Text. (ii) is not urged in the Arm. Commentary, and must not be ascribed to Philo's LXX, though it is also found in Eus. *Eccles. Theolog.* l. ii. 137. In the solutio of Qu. 2 the citation recurs without Κύριος. (iii) is in (Holmes) 130. Slav. Georg. and is urged by the Commentary. The oak, says Philo, was the mean between the two extremes of seen God and seeing man, that is the medium in which and through which God revealed himself; and he appositely remarks that there were religionists who, because the fruit of the oak had served man for food long before he had corn, therefore attributed life and power to the tree, and esteemed it to be the temple and altar of the one God. (Thus Philo virtually associates this apparition of God ἐν τῇ δρυὶ to Abraham with the tree-worship with which he was familiar. Perhaps he had the cult of Jupiter Ammon in his mind.) This in itself would account for the changing in later MSS. of LXX of ἐν into πρὸς. (iv) is also repeated in the solutio, besides being in (Holmes) 25. Euseb. *Eccles. Theolog.* l. c. We may, therefore, ascribe it to Philo's LXX.

Qu. 2.—Ch. xviii. 2: Τί ἐστιν Εἶδεν καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες τρεῖς εἰστήκεισαν ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ;

Here Tisch. has τρεῖς ἄνδρες.

The Arm. solutio of this Quaestio (p. 224, Aucher's Ed.)

has embedded in it several fragments of this chapter xviii, which in the following retranslation of the solutio are underlined: Τὸ λεγόμενον γὰρ (verse 1) ᾧφθη αὐτῷ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ (3) Κύριε, εἰ ἄρα εὖρον χάριν ἐναντίον σου, καὶ (3) μὴ παρέλθης τὸν δοῦλόν σου, καὶ τὸ (5) οὕτω ποιήσον καθὼς εἴρηκας, Καὶ ὁ (9) εἶπε πρὸς αὐτὸν Ποῦ ἐστι Σάρρα ἡ γυνή σου, καὶ (10) ἐπαναστρέφων ἤξω πρὸς σε ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ καὶ (13) εἶπε πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός. Τί ὅτι ἐγέλασε Σάρρα ; ταῦτα πάντα ἐνδείκνυσι ὥσπερ θεοῦ φαντασίαν. Ἄλλ' ὥσπερ ἀνδρῶν ξένων ἐκεῖνα, (2) ἀναβλέψας τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς εἶδεν καὶ ἄνδρες τρεῖς εἰσπήκισαν ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ (2) ἔδραμεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς καὶ (4) νυψάτωσαν τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν, καὶ (4) καταλύξατε ὑπὸ τὸ δένδρον καὶ τὸ (5) φάγεσθε καὶ τὸ (8) εἰσπήκει ἐναντίον αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ (16) ἐξαναστάντες ἐκείθεν οἱ ἄνδρες.

We take the above citations in the order given. In verse 3 δοῦλον for παῖδα is in I. Aug. et sic Ambr. bis, ubique. We may, probably, ascribe δοῦλον to Philo's LXX, even though in Philo ii. 20, the best MSS. in giving the citation read παῖδα. The Arm. Vulg. has δοῦλον. In verse 10 ἐπαναστρέφων is read in Philo i. 456, but in ii. 20 is read ἐπαιών (which, however, is omitted in the Lincoln College MS. of Philo). In verse 13 we have (i) ὁ Θεός for Κύριος, and (ii) ἐν ἐαυτῇ omitted after Σάρρα. As to (i) in Qu. 17, Κύριος is read, and not ὁ Θεός, whence we may, perhaps, infer that Philo read in his LXX Κύριος ὁ Θεός found in (Holmes) 14, 16, 18, 25, 56, 57, 73, 77, 78, 79, 108, 128, 129, 131. Cat. Nic. As to (ii), since ἐν ἐαυτῇ is also omitted in Qu. 17, we may infer that it was not in Philo's LXX. It is omitted in Just. M. *Dial.*, p. 254, et *Dial.* parte secunda, 409.

In verse 2 ἔδραμεν may be accepted, but on πρὸς αὐτοὺς see below the discussion of Quaestio 3. In verse 8 Tisch. reads παρεισπήκει αὐτοῖς, and no source gives hint of any other reading.

It may be remarked that the solutio of this Quaestio 2 (Aucher, p. 245) contains three verses of Homer's *Od.* XVII,

485, of the second of which the Armenian version affords so choice an emendation that I venture to add them :—

καὶ τε θεοὶ ξείνοισιν ἐοικότες ἀλλοδαποῖσι  
παντοῖοί τε λαθόντες ἐπιστροφῶσι πόλῃας,  
ἀνθρώπων ὕβρεις τε καὶ εὐνομίας ἐφορῶντες.

Instead of τε λαθόντες the texts of Homer have τελέθοντες.

Qu. 3.—Ch. xviii. 2 : Διὰ τί φησι Ἰδὼν ἔδραμεν εἰς συνάν-  
τησιν αὐτοῖς καὶ προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ;

Here (i) is omitted after αὐτοῖς the words : ἀπὸ τῆς θύρας τῆς σκηνῆς αὐτοῦ. (ii) ἔδραμεν for προσέδραμεν. Neither change is endorsed by the evidence of any other source, and they must be mere accidents of citation.

Qu. 4.—Ch. xviii. 3 : Κύριε, εἰ εὖρον χάριν ἐναντίον σου, μὴ παρέλθῃς τὸν δοῦλόν σου ;

Here ἄρα is omitted before εὖρον. In Philo ii. 20, Mangey's Text omits ἄρα, as does the oldest Paris MS. of Philo, No. 435, though the Lincoln MS., which is a good authority, supplies ἄρα. In the solutio of Qu. 2 we found the citation with ἄρα, so that weight must not be attached to its omission here. It is remarkable that, like Philo, other early Greek Fathers sometimes add ἄρα in citations of this verse and sometimes omit it, e.g. Chrys. ix. 676, and Cyr. Al. vii, parte secunda, 20, 268.

We have seen above that δοῦλον was probably read in Philo's LXX.

In the Arm. solutio (Aucher, p. 247) Gen. iv. 13 is again cited, and this time without any ambiguity ; the passage is as follows : ὅθεν καὶ ὁ ἀδελφοκτόνος Κάιν φησι Μείζων ἡ αἰτία (lit. "damnum poenae") τὸ ἀφεθῆναι με, αἰνιττόμενος ὅτι μείζων οὐκ ἔστι ζημία ἢ ἀπολείπεσθαι ὑπὸ Θεοῦ· ὁ δὲ Μώσης ἐν ἄλλῳ τόπῳ λέγει, Μὴ ποτε ἀπαλλάξῃ ἀπ' αὐτῶν Κύριος (Exodus xix. 22), where our LXX reads ἀπαλλάξῃ.

Qu. 5.—Ch. xviii. 4 : Διὰ τί πάλιν πληθυντικῶς λέγει Ληφθήτω ὕδωρ καὶ νιψάτωσαν τοὺς πόδας αὐτῶν καὶ καταψύξατε ὑπὸ (? τὸ) δένδρον πυκνόν (Cod. B. omits) ;

Here (i) δῆ is omitted after ληφθήτω.

(ii) *πυκνόν* is added.

This verse has already been cited, but without (ii), which is, probably, a copyist's gloss. No other source omits *δή*, though some codd. read *δέ*. The solutio cites Gen. i. 2: *πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος*.

Qu. 6.—Ch. xviii. 5: *Διὰ τί φησιν Οὕτως ποίησον καθὼς εἶρηκας*;

Qu. 8.—Ch. xviii. 6, 7: *Διὰ τί πάντες σπεύδουσι; φησὶ γάρ, ἔσπευσεν Ἀβραάμ ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνὴν πρὸς Σάρρα καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Σπεῦδσον καὶ φύρασον τρία μέτρα σεμιδάλεως καὶ ποίησον ἐγκρυφίας, καὶ εἰς τὰς βόας ἔδραμεν καὶ ἔλαβεν μοσχάριον ἀπαλὸν καὶ ἔδωκε τῷ παιδί, καὶ ἐτάχυνε τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτό;*

Here (i) *Ἀβραάμ* is omitted after *ἔδραμεν*.

(ii) *μοσχάριον ἀπαλὸν* for *ἀπαλὸν μοσχ*.

(iii) *καὶ καλόν* is omitted.

(i) may be due to citation; (ii) is in I, 14–16, 18, 19, 25, 32, 38, 56, 57, 59, 68, 71–73, 77–79, 82, 106–108, 128–131, 134, 135. Compl. Alex. Cat. Nic. Chrys. iv. 419. Athan. ii. 446. The other variant (iii) is in no other source; we can, therefore, only ascribe (ii) to Philo's LXX.

In the solutio (Aucher, p. 252) is quoted Exodus xxxiii. 13, as follows: *ἐμφάνισόν μοι σεαυτόν, γνωστῶς ἴδω σε*.

Here *ἴνα* is omitted before *ἴδω*. It was certainly omitted in Philo's LXX, for it is omitted in Philo i. 107, 579; also in (Holmes) II, VII, X, 14–16, 18, 19, 25, 29, 30, 37 bis, 52, 54–59, 64, 73–78, 82, 84, 85, 106, 108, 118, 128–132, 134. Ald. Lips.; Eus. in Pss., p. 102; Cyr. Al. iv. 590; v. 475; vii, parte secunda, 83. Georg.

Qu. 9.—Ch. xviii. 8; *Διὰ τί φησι, Παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔφαγον*;

Qu. 10.—Ch. xviii. 8: *Διὰ τί λέγεται, Αὐτὸς δὲ παρήστηκει αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ τὸ δένδρον*;

Qu. 11.—Ch. xviii. 9: *Διὰ τί πάλιν ἐνικῶς φησι, Ποῦ Σάρρα ἡ γυνή σου; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ*;

Here *ἰδοῦ* is omitted after *εἶπεν*, but merely through citation; for the solutio urges it, and in Philo i. 203, it is supplied.



Qu. 12.—Ch. xviii. 10, 14: Διὰ τί φησω ἐνικῶς Ἐπαναστρέφων ἤξω πρὸς σὲ κατὰ τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον εἰς ὧρας, καὶ ἔσται υἱὸς Σάρρα τῇ γυναικί σου ;

In Philo i. 456 and ii. 20, the usual reading is given: καὶ ἔξει υἱὸν Σάρρα ἡ γυνή σου. Nor does any other source agree with the title. In verse 14, however, we find καὶ ἔσται τῇ Σάρρα υἱός, which is what is translated in the title, which thus renders the beginning of verse 10 and the end of verse 14.

Qu. 13.—Ch. xviii. 10: Διὰ τί φησι, Σάρρα δὲ ἤκουσεν πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ τῆς σκηνῆς οὐσα ὀπίσθεν αὐτοῦ ;

Qu. 14.—Ch. xviii. 11: Διὰ τί φησιν, Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Σάρρα πρεσβύτεροι ἦσαν προβεβηκότες ἡμερῶν ;

Here ἦσαν is added, as in the Arm. Vulgate. In Holmes, 19, Compl., it is added after προβεβηκότες.

Qu. 15.—Ch. xviii. 11: Τί ἐστιν Ἐξέλιπε Σάρρα γίνεσθαι τὰ γυναικεῖα ; Here τῇ is perhaps omitted before Σάρρα as in Philo i. 130.

Qu. 16.—Ch. xviii. 12: Τί ἐστιν, Ἐγέλασε δὲ ἐν ἑαυτῇ Σάρρα λέγουσα Οὐπω μὲν τι γέγονεν ἕως τοῦ νῦν· ὁ δὲ κύριος μου πρεσβύτερος ;

Here (i) ἐν ἑαυτῇ Σ. for Σ. ἐν ἑαυτῇ must be accidental, for Tischendorf's order is given in Philo i. 603. (ii) τι for μοι before γέγονεν is due to a corruption of the Arm. Text, for in the solutio the citation recurs, as follows: οὐπω μὲν μοι γέγονεν ἕως τοῦ νῦν, ὁ δὲ κύριος μου πρεσβύτερος.

Qu. 17.—Ch. xviii. 13: Διὰ τί ἐπετίμησέ πως τῇ Σάρρα· Ἀβραὰμ γὰρ ἐγέλασε καὶ οὐκ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ· φησι γάρ, Καὶ εἶπε Κύριος πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ Τί ὅτι ἐγέλασε Σάρρα λέγουσα Ἀρά γε ἀληθῶς τέξομαι· ἐγὼ δὲ γεγήρακα. Μὴ ἀδυνατήσῃ (ἀδυνατεῖ in B.) τῷ Θεῷ or τοῦ Θεοῦ (+ τὸ B.) ῥῆμα ;

Here (i) ἐν ἑαυτῇ is omitted after ἐγέλασε Σάρρα. The same omission is in Just. M. *Dial.*, p. 254, et *Dial. parte secunda*, 409. We may, therefore, impute it to Philo's LXX. (ii) παρὰ is omitted after ἀδυνατήσῃ. So in MSS. of Holmes, 16 and 75. Both τῷ Θεῷ and τοῦ Θεοῦ are found in the earliest MSS., and either of them is compatible with

the Armenian, which is only decisive as to the omission of *παρά*. The citation is made in Philo, *De Abrahamo* i. 17, where texts and codices alike conflict. Mangey and Turnebus read: *Μὴ ἀδυνατεῖ παρά τῷ Θεῷ ῥῆμα*; but the Lincoln MS. has: *μὴ ἀδυνατεῖ παρά τῷ Θεῷ πᾶν ῥῆμα*; Paris MS. Gk., 435—the oldest of our MSS. of Philo—has *μὴ ἀδυνατεῖ παρά Θεοῦ ῥῆμα*; The Armenian solutio makes for the omission of *παρά*, for it begins thus: *ὅτι τὰ θεῖα ῥήματα ἔργα καὶ δυνάμεις εἰσι, δηλὸν διὰ τῶν προτέρων, ὅτι τῷ θεῷ (or τοῦ θείου) οὐδὲν ἀδύνατον*. All the above readings are represented in the Greek codices, and amidst such a conflict of evidence there can be no certainty how in Philo's LXX the passage was read. The Arm. Vulg. has *παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ῥῆμα*.

Qu. 18.—Ch. xviii. 14: *Τί ἐστιν Εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτου ἀναστρέψω πρὸς σὲ εἰς ὥρας καὶ ἔσται υἱὸς τῇ Σάρρα*;

Here we have *υἱὸς τῇ Σ.* for *τῇ Σ. υἱός*: a variant not found in any other source.

Qu. 19.—Ch. xviii. 15: *Διὰ τί ἡρνήσατο Σάρρα λέγουσα, οὐκ ἐγέλασα· ἐφοβήθη γάρ. Καὶ αὐτὸς (potius ἐκεῖνος) εἶπεν, οὐχί, ἀλλὰ ἐγέλασας*;

Here *αὐτὸς εἶπεν* is read for *εἶπεν αὐτῇ*, a variant not found elsewhere, though *αὐτῇ* is omitted in (Holmes) I, 14, 15, 16, 18, 25, 31, 56, 59, 68, 72, 73, 75, 77, 78, 82, 120, 121, 128, 129, 130, 131. Ald. Alex. Cat. Nic. Copt. Arab. 1, 2, 3. Georg.

From Philo *De Abr.* ii. 30, one might suppose that in Philo's LXX there was added after or before *ἐγέλασας* the words: *μηδὲν εὐλαβήθης*. Philo's Commentary is as follows: *Διόπερ θαρσύνων αὐτὴν ὁ ἱερὸς λόγος φησὶν. Μηδὲν εὐλαβήθης, ὥντως ἐγέλασας, καὶ μέτεστί σοι χαρὰς. Οὐ γὰρ εἴασεν ὁ πατὴρ τὸ ἀνθρώπων γένος λύπαις καὶ οὐδύναις καὶ ἄχθεσιν ἀνιάτοις ἐμφέρεσθαι κ.τ.λ.* It cannot be by a mere coincidence that the Armenian solutio also implies the addition of *μηδὲν εὐλαβήθης*. Aucher faithfully renders it as follows: "Unde acceptans propitius ille, et dulcis ac beneficis animi pudorem reverentia, oratione, et timore

Dei affectum, dicit ei: *Noli Timere*, non enim timoris est res, ita ut negare velis. Risisti ergo, et gaudio impleta es," &c.

Qu. 20.—Ch. xviii. 16: Διὰ τί Ἀβραὰμ συνεπορεύετο μετ' αὐτῶν, συμποπέμπων αὐτούς ;

Qu. 21.—Ch. xviii. 17: Διὰ τί φησι, Μὴ κρύψω (B + ἐγὼ) ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ τοῦ δούλου μου ἃ (or ὃ) ἐγὼ ποιῶ ;

Here (i) οὐ is omitted before μὴ. (ii) ἐγὼ is omitted after κρύψω. (iii) δούλου instead of παιδός. But this last variant is doubtful, for the Armenian translator may have rendered παιδός as if it were δούλου. The Armenian equivalent of παῖς has the secondary meaning of *servant* or *slave*, just like παῖς or *garçon* in French. Supposing however φίλον to have been the original reading, the shuffle δούλου and παιδός is intelligible, both being of the nature of corrections.

The verse is cited elsewhere in Philo i. 93, thus: Μὴ κρύψω ἐγὼ ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ τοῦ παιδός μου ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ ; and i. 401, thus: Μὴ ἐπικαλύψω ἐγὼ ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ τοῦ φίλου μου ;

It is certain, therefore, that (i) was in Philo's LXX. οὐ is also omitted in (Holmes) I, 14, 15, 16, 18, 25, 31, 56, 57, 59, 73, 75, 77, 78, 82, 83, 128, 131. Ald. Alex. Cat. Nic. ; Epiph. ii. 34 ; Arm. 1, 2. Arm. Ed. Variant (ii) is in (Holmes) 19, 108, 135. Compl. et Chrys. vii. 314, licet habeat alibi: but one hesitates to impute it to Philo's LXX.

Qu. 22.—Ch. xviii. 19: Διὰ τί φησιν, Ἥδειν γὰρ ὅτι συντάξει τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ μετὰ αὐτόν, καὶ φυλάξουσιν τὰς ὁδοὺς Κυρίου, ποιεῖν δικαιοσύνην καὶ κρίσιν, ὅπως ἂν ἐπαγάγῃ ἐπὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἃ ἐλάλησεν πρὸς αὐτόν ;

Here (i) Κύριος is omitted after ἐπαγάγῃ.

(ii) ἃ for πάντα ὅσα.

Both variants may be set down to Philo's LXX. The second one, ἃ, is read in (Holmes) 15, 72, 82, and πάντα is furthermore omitted in 59, 130. Also Chrys. i. 82, iv. 426 and Eus. ii. 233, read ἃ for ὅσα.

Qu. 23.—Ch. xviii. 20: Τί ἐστίν, Εἶπε δὲ Κύριος, Κραυγὴ Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρων πεπληθύνεται καὶ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῶν μεγάλαι σφόδρα ;

Here (i) Γομόρρων for Γομόρρας.

(ii) πρὸς με omitted after πεπληθύνεται.

Both are due to Philo's LXX: (i) is in (Holmes) I; (ii) in (Holmes) I, 15, 59, 68, 72. 82, 120, 121. Alex. Just. M. *Dial.* 254; Bas. i. 139; Hier. Aug. Hilar. Ambr. Auctor de Praedict. ap. Prosp. Anonym. ap. Aug.; Arab. 1, 2; Arm. 1, 2. Arm. Ed.

Qu. 24.—Ch. xviii. 21: Διὰ τί ἀνθρωπικῶς φησι λέγων, Καταβὰς οὖν ὄψομαι εἰ κατὰ τὴν κραυγὴν αὐτῶν τὴν ἐρχομένην πρὸς με ἐργάζονται, εἰ δὲ μή, ἵνα γινῶ ;

Here ἐργάζονται for συντελοῦνται. Such a reading is not found elsewhere. The Arm. solutio also implies it: "num sequantur vocem facta eorum, an aliud dicunt sicut culpabile, et aliud faciunt minus culpandum: multi enim male loquentes, virtutes faciunt et bene proferentes, leges violant per facta eorum." Here the Arm. word which I render by facta=ἔργα. Ambrose, in paraphrasing the passage, used the word "commissa," which hardly reflects the "opere compleverint" by which Hieronymus rendered συντελοῦνται. Lastly, the Armenian Vulgate translates συντελοῦνται quite literally, and so militates against the supposition that the translator of Philo only paraphrased συντελοῦνται in this passage.

Qu. 25.—Ch. xviii. 22: Διὰ τί πάλιν ἐνικῶς φησιν, Ἀβραὰμ δὲ ἦν ἐστὼς ἔτι ἐναντίον τοῦ Κυρίου ;

Perhaps the original Greek of the Quaestio had: ἦν ἔτι ἐστὼς, which is read in (Holmes) 72, 129. Cat. Nic. Aug. Slav. Ostrog. Tischendorf has: ἔτι ἦν ἐστηκώς. I render the Arm. by ἐστὼς, because ἐστὼς is read in Philo i. 231, 688, and is not repugnant to the version.

Qu. 26.—Ch. xviii. 23: Τί ἐστι, Καὶ ἐγγίσας Ἀβραάμ, εἶπε, μὴ συναπολέσεις (συναπολλύεις B.), τὸν δίκαιον μετὰ τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς καὶ ἔσται ὁ δίκαιος ὡς ὁ ἀσεβής ;

Here (i) συναπολέσεις for συναπολέσης may be a device

of rendering. It is found, however, in (Holmes) 59, 75. Greg. Nyss. iii. 362; Theodoret v. 1005. (ii) *τόν* and *τοῦ* added before *δίκαιον* and *ἀσεβοῦς* may be a device of rendering. In the Armenian the whole sentence is read as a question, and so, doubtless, it was read in Philo's LXX, for Holmes notes thus: "ad finem interrogative distinguunt." Alex. Just. M. *Dial.*, 255; Orig. ii. 631; Chrys. iv. 428; Theodoret v. 1005; Procop. in Cat. Nic. 239. Slav.

Qu. 27.—Ch. xviii. 24–32: *Διὰ τί ἀπὸ πεντήκοντα ἀρξάμενος καὶ εἰς δέκα τελευτᾷ; καὶ διὰ τί ἐν ἀρχῇ πέντε πέντε δις ἀφαιρεῖ ἕως τοῦ τεσσαράκοντα, ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων δέκα δέκα ἕως τοῦ τέλους τῆς δεκάδος· εἶπε γὰρ Ἐὰν ᾧσι πεντήκοντα δίκαιοι ἐν τῇ πόλει, ἀπολείς αὐτούς; οὐκ ἀνήσεις τὸν τόπον· τί δέ, ἐὰν ᾧσι πέντε καὶ τεσσαράκοντα; ἐὰν δὲ τεσσαράκοντα; τί δὲ ἐὰν τριάκοντα; ἀλλὰ δέ, ἐὰν εἴκοσι; τί δέ, ἐὰν δέκα;*

Here the omission of *πάντα* before *τὸν τόπον* is probably due to Philo's LXX, for it occurs in (Holmes) 35. Alex.

Qu. 28.—Ch. xviii. 27: *Διὰ τί φησι, Νῦν ἡρξάμην λαλῆσαι πρὸς τὸν Κύριον· ἐγὼ δὲ γῇ εἰμὶ καὶ τέφρα;*

In Philo i. 296, 477, *τέφρα* is read for *σποδός*, and since it answers to the Armenian no less well than *σποδός* I retain it, but the version is not decisive of it as against *σποδός*.

The other variants are: (i) *μου* omitted after *Κύριον*. (ii) *γῇ εἰμὶ* for *εἰμὶ γῇ*. Cod. B. has *εἰμὶ γῇ*; so we may only set down to Philo's LXX variant (i), which is also found in (Holmes) I, III, X, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 25, 56, 57, 59, 61, 68, 73, 78, 79, 82, 108, 120, 121, 128, 129, 131, 135. Compl. Cat. Nic. Arab. 1, 2. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed. Georg. (ii) is in Arm. Vulgate.

Qu. 29.—Ch. xviii. 33: *Τί ἐστιν, Ἀπῆλθεν ὁ Κύριος, ὥς ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἀπέστρεψεν εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ;*

Qu. 30.—Ch. xix. 1: *Διὰ τί τριῶν ὀφθέντων φησιν, Ἦλθον οἱ δύο ἄγγελοι εἰς Σόδομα ἐσπέρας;*

Qu. 31.—Ch. xix. 2: *Διὰ τί Λὼτ ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν πύλιν Σοδόμων;*

Qu. 32.—Ch. xix. 1 : Τί ἐστιν, Ἰδὼν ἐξανέστη εἰς συνάντησιν αὐτοῖς, προσεκύνησε τῷ προσώπῳ ;

Here (i) Λώτ is omitted before ἐξανέστη.

(ii) ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν omitted after προσεκύνησε.

Both seem due to citation.

Qu. 33.—Ch. xix. 2 : Διὰ τί κληθέντες εἰς ξενοδοχίαν ἀποτρέπονται, λέγοντες, Οὐχί, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ πλατείᾳ καταλύσομεν ;

Qu. 34.—Ch. xix. 3 : Τί ἐστι κατεβιάσατο αὐτούς, καὶ ἐξέκλιναν πρὸς αὐτόν ;

Qu. 35.—Ch. xix. 3 : Διὰ τί ὁ μὲν ἐποίησεν αὐτοῖς πότον καὶ ἀζύμους, Ἀβραὰμ δὲ ἐγκρυφίας καὶ οὐ (B. omits) πότον ;

Qu. 36.—Ch. xix. 4 : Διὰ τί οἱ Σοδομίται περιεκύκλωσαν τὴν οἰκίαν ἀπὸ νεανίσκου ἕως πρεσβυτέρων, ἅπας ὁ λαὸς ἅμα ; Here B. has νεανίσκων, and so has the Arm. Vulgate, but both independently of one another. πρεσβυτέρων for πρεσβυτέρου is also evidenced by the Armenian Vulgate.

Qu. 37.—Ch. xix. 5 : Τί ἐστιν Ἐξάγαγε αὐτοὺς πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ἵνα συγγενώμεθα αὐτοῖς (or πρὸς αὐτούς) ;

Qu. 38.—Ch. xix. 7, 8 : Διὰ τί εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς (or αὐτοῖς) Λώτ, Μὴ οὕτω, ἀδελφοί, μὴ πονηρεύεσθε (or πονηρεύσησθε)· εἰσὶ δέ μοι δύο θυγατέρες, αἱ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ἄνδρα· ἐξάξω αὐτὰς πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ χρήσασθε αὐταῖς (B. omits) καθὰ ἀρέσκει ὑμῖν· μόνον εἰς τοὺς ἄνδρας μὴδὲν ἄδικον ποιήσητε, οὗ ἕνεκεν εἰσῆλθον ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην τῶν δοκῶν μου ;

Here (i) μὴ οὕτως for μὴδαμῶς.

(ii) τούτους omitted after ἀνδράς (but B. adds τούτους).

(iii) μὴδὲν ἄδ. ποι. for μὴ ποι. ἄδ.

(iv) στέγην for σκέπην.

(v) ἀρέσκει for ἂν ἀρέσκοι.

(vi) πονηρεύεσθε for πονερεύσησθε.

Of these (i) and (ii) are not in any other source and may be discarded. But (iii) is virtually found in Holmes, 20, and Chrys. iv. 440. Holmes notes also : ἄδικον] praemittunt μὴδὲν X, 15, 16, 18, 25, 38, 56, 57, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 107, 128, 129, 131, 134, 135, Alex. Cat. Nic. (iv) is in I, III, X, 14, 15, 18, 25, 31, 32, 55, 56, 57, 59, 68, 71, 72, 73,

78, 79, 82, 120, 121, 128, 129, 131. Ald. Copt. (v) is in 18, 20, 25, 31, 59, 72, 75, 82, 106, 107. Ald. Chrys. *l. c.* (vi) is in 14, 16, 18, 19, 25, 38, 57, 59, 68, 73, 77, 78, 79, 106, 107, 131, 135.

We may probably ascribe all these variants to Philo's LXX.

Qu. 39.—Ch. xix. 9 : *Τί ἐστιν, Εἶπαν ἀπόστα ἐκεῖ· εἰσῆλθες παροικεῖν, μὴ καὶ κρίσιν κρίνειν ;*

Here *αὐτῷ* is omitted after *εἶπαν*, a variant which we may impute to Philo's LXX, since it is in (Holmes) I, X, 15, 16, 18, 25, 31, 38, 56, 59, 68, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 79, 82, 83, 106, 120, 121, 128, 129, 130, 131, 134, 135. Ald. Copt. Alex. Slav. Ostrog. Arm. 1, 2. Arm. Ed. Georg.

Qu. 40.—Ch. xix. 10, 11 : *Τί ἐστιν, Ἐκτείναντες οἱ ἄνδρες τὰς χεῖρας εἰσεσπᾶσαντο τὸν Λῶτ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὸν οἶκον καὶ τὰς θύρας τοῦ οἴκου ἀπέκλεισαν· τοὺς δὲ ἄνδρας τοὺς ὄντας ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας (τοῦ οἴκου B.) ἐπάταξαν ἀορασίᾳ ;*

Here (i) *τὰς θύρας* for *τὴν θύραν*. This is doubtful.

(ii) *τοῦ οἴκου* omitted after *ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας*.

(iii) *ἐν* omitted after *ἐπάταξαν*.

Of these, (i) is in Holmes, 107 ; (ii) is in 19 Compl. ; (iii) is in I, III, X, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 25, 55, 56, 57, 59, 68, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 82, 83, 106, 107, 120, 121, 128, 129, 130, 131, 134, 135. Ald. Orig. i. 437 et ii. 37 ; Chrys. iv. 443 ; Cyr. Al. i, parte prima, 25. We may, perhaps, ascribe (iii) to Philo's LXX, for the Armenian *solutio* seems to urge it : *Τρία ἐποίησαν, τὸν ξενόδοκον ἔσωσαν καὶ τὰς θύρας ἐπέκλεισαν καὶ τοὺς ἐπιόντας καὶ βιαζομένους ἐτύφλωσαν.*

Qu. 41.—Ch. xix. 11 : *Τί ἐστι, Καὶ παρελύθησαν ζητοῦντες τὴν θύραν ;*

Qu. 42.—Ch. xix. 12, 13 : *Τί ἐστιν, Εἶπαν οἱ ἄνδρες πρὸς τὸν Λῶτ ἐξαγαγεῖν πάντας οἰκέλους αὐτοῦ, ὅτι μέλλομεν ἀπολλύσειν τὸν τόπον· ὅτι ὑψώθη, φησι, ἡ κραυγὴ αὐτῶν ἔναντι τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἡμᾶς ἐκτρίψαι ;*

The formal citation begins, as the introduced *φησι* shows, at *ὅτι ὑψώθη*. The variants, therefore, in the earlier part of

the title are due to citation only. The beginning of verse 13 is formally cited in the Arm. solutio : ἀλλ' οὐ τυχόντως, ἀλλὰ φυσικῶς γέγραπται, ἀπόλλυμεν τοὺς τόπους τούτους.

The genuine variants, then, are these :

(i) τοὺς τόπους τούτους for τὸν τόπον τοῦτον. This is in no other source.

(ii) Κύριος omitted before ἐκτρίψαι. This is in Holmes, 71.

(iii) αὐτήν omitted after ἐκτρίψαι. This is not in any other source, though some read αὐτούς.

In the Armenian solutio the words ἀπέστειλεν ἡμᾶς ἐκτρίψαι are cited afresh, so that we may infer that variants (ii) and (iii) were in Philo's LXX.

Qu. 43.—Ch. xix. 14: Διὰ τί φησιν Ἀρηγγέλθη τῷ Λὼτ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἔδοξε δὲ τοῖς γαμβροῖς γελωτοποιεῖν ;

This seems to be a paraphrase as far as ἀγγέλων, though introduced by φησίν. The words ἔδοξε δὲ τ. γ. γελ., however, seem to represent Philo's Text of the LXX, for the sense, "*and it seemed good to the sons-in-law to make mock,*" is incompatible with ἐναντίον τῶν γαμβρῶν. Of such a reading of the passage there is no trace in any other source, though the minor variant γελωτοποιεῖν for γελοιάζειν is found in (Holmes) 32. The Armenian solutio confirms γελωτοποιεῖν, but does not bear on the rest of the Quaestio ; and Philo nowhere else cites the passage.

Qu. 44.—Ch. xix. 16: Διὰ τί οἱ ἄγγελοι παραχθέντες τῆς τοῦ Λὼτ ἐκράτησαν τῆς χειρὸς καὶ τῆς τῆς γυναικὸς καὶ τῆς τῶν θυγατέρων ;

Aucher's Latin version of this and of the last Quaestio is very wide of the mark. The above title clearly implies that it was the angels who were disturbed, and, therefore, held Lot's hand, and so indicates to us that the reading of Philo's LXX is reflected rather in Holmes' MS. 75 than in any other ; for that source has ἐταράχθησαν οἱ ἄγγελοι καὶ ἐκράτησαν. The piety of a later age would naturally have changed the reading so as to make it appear that it was Lot and not the angels who were scared.

Of the other variants, the omission of τῆς χειρὸς before



τῆς γυναικός, and of τῶν χειρῶν before τῶν θυγατέρων is, probably, not due to mere exigencies of citation, for in (Holmes) 71 we find both omissions, and it was characteristic of Philo's LXX to be without such additions, made in a later age to give precision to the narrative. The omission of δύο before θυγατέρων may be imputed with certainty to Philo's LXX, for it is in (Holmes) 14, 16, 18, 25, 38, 57, 73, 77, 78, 131. Just. M. *Dial.* 255. The Armenian solutio is very obscure in its bearing on the title.

Qu. 45.—Ch. xix. 17: Διὰ τί οἱ ἐξαγαγόντες ἄγγελοι φασὶ Σῶζε τὴν σεαυτοῦ ψυχὴν· μὴ βλέψῃ εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, μηδὲ στῆς ἐν πάσῃ τῇ περιχώρῳ ταύτῃ;

Here (i) σῶζων is omitted before σῶζε. So in (Holmes) 55, 72, 76, 82, 134, 135. Chrys. iv. 445: Athan. ii. 448; Bas. i. 604; Arm. 1, 2. Arm. Ed. (ii) βλέψῃ for περιβλέψῃ is in 31, 68, 83. Ald. (iii) ταύτῃ added after περιχώρῳ is found in Slav. Ostrog. Probably all these variants were in Philo's LXX.

Qu. 46.—Ch. xix. 17: Τί ἐστίν, εἰς τὸ ὅρος σῶζου, μή ποτε συμπαρηφθῆς;

Qu. 47.—Ch. xix. 19, 20: Τί ἐστίν, εἰπέ Λώτ, ἐγὼ οὐ δυνήσομαι διασωθῆναι εἰς τὸ ὅρος. μή ποτε Καταλάβῃ με τὰ κακὰ καὶ ἀποθάνω. Ἴδου ἡ πόλις αὕτη ἐγγὺς τοῦ καταφυγεῖν εἰς ἐκείνην, ἣ ἐστὶ μικρά, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶ μικρά· ἐκεῖ διασωθήσομαι, Καὶ ζήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ μου;

Here we have (i) εἰς ἐκείνην for με ἐκεῖ.

(ii) καὶ οὐκ ἐ. μ. ἐκεῖ διασ. instead of καὶ ἐκεῖ διασωθήσομαι. οὐ μικρά ἐστι;

(iii) ἔνεκεν σοῦ omitted after ψυχὴ μου.

(iv) ἡ πόλις for πόλις.

Of these (iv) is in I, X, 15, 16, 18, 20, 25, 31, 38, 55, 56, 57, 59, 68, 72, 73, 76, 77, 79, 82, 83, 106, 120, 121, 128, 129, 130, 131, 134. Compl. Alex. Just. M. *Dial.* 256; Chrys. iv. 445; Athan. ii. 448; Cyril Al. i, parte primus, 28; Theodorete v. 1009. The reading (ii) ἣ ἐστὶ μικρὰ καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶ μικρά is confirmed by Philo ii. 25, and certainly stood in Philo's LXX; as also (iii), which is in I, 55, 59, 68, 72,

74, 76, 82, 134, 135. Just M. *l. c.*; Athan. *l. c.*; Cyr. Al. *l. c.*; Theodoret *l. c.* uncis inclusit Alex.

Qu. 48.—Ch. xix. 21 : Τί ἐστίν, Ἰδοὺ ἐθαύμασα τὸ πρόσωπον σου καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ῥήματι τούτῳ ;

Here we have τὸ πρ. σ. for σ. τὸ πρ. The same reading is in (Holmes) 15, 72, 82, 135. Cyr. Al. i, parte prima, 30 licet alibi ut Vat. Slav. Arab. 3. Arm. 1, 2. Arm. Ed. Georg. We may impute it to Philo's LXX.

Qu. 49.—Ch. xix. 22 : Τί ἐστι, Σπεῦσον τοῦ σωθῆναι ἐκεῖ ;

Here οὖν is omitted after σπεῦσον. The omission must have stood in Philo's LXX, since it is found in 14, 16, 18, 25, 38, 57, 73, 77, 79, 128, 131. Cat. Nic. Just. M. *Dial.* 256.

Qu. 50.—Ch. xix. 22 : Τί ἐστι, Διὰ τοῦτο ἐκάλεσε τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως Ζούρ ;

(i) ἐκεῖνης is omitted after πόλεως.

(ii) Ζούρ for Σηγώρ.

Of these the former is in (Holmes) I, 14, 15, 55, 59, 76, 82, 134. Just. M. *Dial.* 256. Arab. 1, 2. Uncis includit Alex. Both must be ascribed to Philo's LXX. Some of the MSS. of the Arm. Philo have Ζούρ instead of Ζούρ.

Qu. 51.—Ch. xix. 23, 24 : Διὰ τί ὁ ἥλιος ἐξῆλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ Ἀὼτ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Ζούρ. Καὶ Κύριος ἔβρεξεν ἐπὶ Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα θεῖον καὶ πῦρ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ;

Here (i) Ζούρ for Σηγώρ.

(ii) παρὰ Κυρίου omitted after πῦρ.

The Quaestio as far as end of verse 23 is preserved in Greek along with the solutio (R. Harris, p. 34), but ἐξῆλθεν ὁ ἥ. is read, and Σηγώρ instead of Ζούρ. The two verses are also cited in Philo i. 633, where Σηγώρ is read, and παρὰ Κυρίου ἐξ οὐρανοῦ omitted, or at least not cited. We must ascribe (i) and (ii) to Philo's LXX.

Qu. 52.—Ch. xix. 26 : Διὰ τί ἐπέβλεψεν ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, καὶ ἐγένετο στήλη ἀλός, οὐχὶ δὲ ἄλλης τιμος ὕλης ;

In Philo *De Prof.* i. 564, we read : Οὕτω φησὶ τὴν γυναῖκα Ἀὼτ στραφεῖσαν εἰς τοῦπίσω γενέσθαι στήλην. This citation implies that in some of Philo's copies of the LXX there was read in Gen. xix. 26, not ἐπέβλεψεν but ἐπέστρεψεν.

So also in Philo i. 657: Τὴν γὰρ Ἀὼτ γυναικα καὶ ἐπιστραφεῖσαν εἰς τοῦπίσω φασιν οἱ χρησμοὶ γενέσθαι στήλην ἀλῶν. But that ἐπέβλεψεν was also read by him is clear from the Commentary which follows this citation, thus: εἰκότως δὲ καὶ προσηκόντως. Εἰ γάρ τις μὴ τὰ πρόσω θέας καὶ ἀκοῆς ἄξια διορᾷ· ταῦτα δὲ εἰσιν ἀρεταὶ καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὰς ἀρετὰς ἔργα. περιβλέπεται δὲ τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ τὰ νώτια, κωφὴν δόξαν καὶ τυφλὸν πλοῦτον. The Armenian Commentary reveals the same ambiguity. The solutio of Qu. 45 (Aucher, p. 280) urges in ch. xix. 17 μὴ βλέψη or μὴ περιβλέψη, yet in the Commentary on Qu. 52 (Aucher, pp. 287–8) we read (I give Aucher's Latin, which is faithful): "Ratio nunc reddenda, quare mandaverint Angeli non redire retrorsum . . . quam ob rem revertitur ut putatur in Sodomam . . . quoniam mandaverant Angeli non redire in tergum, quae transgressa est mandatum." It looks almost as if Philo had one reading in his Text of the LXX, and the other as a variant in the margin. The Armenian Vulgate implies ἔστρεψεν or ἑστράφη as its original.

Qu. 53.—Ch. xix. 27: Διὰ τί ὀρθρίσας τῷ πρώτῳ Ἀβραὰμ εἰς τὸν τόπον οὗ εἰστίηκει ἐναντίον τοῦ Κυρίου, ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρων καὶ περὶ χώραν ἐκείνων καὶ ἰδὼν ἀνέβαινε φλόξ τῆς γῆς ὥσεί φλόξ καμίνου;

Here (i) Tisch. has ὥρθρισε δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ πρώτῳ: (ii) the title adds τοῦ before Κυρίου: (iii) Γομόρρων for Γομόρρας: (iv) περὶ χώραν ἐκείνων for ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τῆς περιχώρου: (v) καὶ εἶδε omitted before καὶ ἰδοῦ: (vi) τῆς γῆς for ἐκ τῆς γῆς: (vii) φλόξ καμίνου for ἀτμὶς καμίνου.

Of these (i) is in 56 and 129, but it seems to be due to citation only; (iii) is in 108. Compl.; (vi) is found in X, 14, 16, 18, 25, 38, 57, 59, 72, 73, 77, 79, 128, 131. Alex. Copt. Arab. 1, 2. Arm. 1, 2. Arm. Ed.

With the exception of (i) and (vi) all these variants seem to have stood in Philo's LXX.

Qu. 54.—Ch. xix. 29: Διὰ τί μετὰ τὸ ἐκτρίψαι τοὺς περιούκους Σοδόμων, ἐμνήσθη ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Ἀβραάμ· Καὶ ἐξαπέστειλε τὸν Ἀὼτ ἐκ μέσου τῆς καταστροφῆς;

Here (i) μετὰ τὸ ἐκτ. for ἐν τῷ ἐκτ.

(ii) τοὺς περιούκους Σοδόμων for τὸν Θεὸν πάσας τὰς πόλεις τῆς περιούκων.

Perhaps these are due to citation. The end of verse 29, ἐν τῷ καταστρέψαι κ. τ. λ., is omitted in (Holmes) VI, and it is significant that Philo's Commentary proceeds direct to verse 30 without citing or in any way implying the words thus omitted in VI.

Qu. 55.—Ch. xix. 30 : Διὰ τί Λὼτ φοβηθεὶς κατοικῆσαι ἐν Σηγῶρ εἰς τὸ ὄρος ἀνέβη καὶ κατοικεῖ ἐν τῷ σπηλαίῳ μετὰ τῶν δύο θυγατέρων ;

The variations must be set down to title. δύο is urged in the Arm. solutio.

Qu. 56.—Ch. xix. 31 : Διὰ τί ἡ πρεσβυτέρα πρὸς τὴν νεωτέραν εἶπε, ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν πρεσβύτερος, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὃς εἰσέρχεται πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὥς καθήκει πάση τῇ γῇ. Δεῦρο καὶ ποτίσωμεν τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν οἶνον καὶ κοιμηθῶμεν μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξαναστήσωμεν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν σπέρμα ;

Here (i) Tisch. has order, εἶπε δὲ ἡ πρεσβ. πρὸς τὴν νεωτέραν : (ii) ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is omitted after οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν : (iii) εἰσέρχεται for εἰσελεύσεται.

Qu. 57.—Ch. xix. 37 : Διὰ τί τεκοῦσα υἱὸν ἡ πρεσβυτέρα καλεῖ τὸ ὄνομα Μωάβ, φωνοῦσα ἐφ' ὃ κρύπτειν ἔδει, ἐκ τοῦ πατρός μου ;

Qu. 58.—Ch. xix. 37 : Διὰ τί ἡ πρεσβυτέρα τεκοῦσα υἱὸν καλεῖ ἐκ πατρός μου· ἡ δὲ νεωτέρα οὕτως λέγει ὅτι Ἀμμάν, υἱὸς γένους μου· καὶ τὸν μὲν λέγει, οὗτος πατὴρ Μωαβιτῶν, τὸν δέ, οὗτος πατὴρ Ἀμμωνιτῶν ἕως τῆς σήμερον ;

The form Ἀμμωνιτῶν is in no other source, though Ἀμμωνιτῶν is in Compl., and Ἀμονιτῶν in Arm. Vulgate. The Codex B. of Philo adds ἕως τῆς σήμερον Μωαβιτῶν.

F. C. CONYBEARE.